REMARKS

In the Office Action mailed May 31, 2005, the Examiner rejected claims 1-4, 6-25 and 27-32. By this response, Applicants traverse these rejections, however, the remarks below are designed to address the Examiner's concerns that are written out in the "Response to Argument" section of the Office Action. Applicants believe that the present remarks provide the Examiner with adequate technical reasons for allowing the claims of the present application. This Response has been reviewed by at least one scientist of the Assignee of the present application to help assure accuracy. Applicants are prepared to provide additional support at the request of the Examiner.

Since the rejections of the current Office Action are the same as the rejections made in the previous Office Action, Applicants merely reassert the arguments made in their previous Response, but additionally address the "Response to Arguments" section of the most recent Office Action.

I. Response to Argument

On page 2, the Office Action of May 31, 2005 suggests that Applicants arguments with respect to U.S. Patent 6,291,019 issued to Locke et al. are not convincing. The Office Action suggests that in Locke et al. "numerous examples show various amount of secondary amines (Jeffamine D-2000), most of which read on the applicant's range." The Office Action goes on to cite *Akzo v. E.I. du Pont de Nemours*, 1 USPQ 2d 1704 (Fed. Cir. 1987) as suggesting that, "Concentration limitation are obvious absent a showing of criticality". In response, Applicants suggest first that Jeffamine D-2000 is actually substantially entirely composed of primary amine. Applicants further suggest that the ranges recited by applicant have a high degree of importance particularly when considered in conjunction with all the language of the claims of the present application.

Jeffamine D-2000

As suggested, Jeffamine D-2000 is substantially entirely composed of primary amine. To verify this information, Applicants have included a technical bulletin from Huntsman Corporation suggesting the primary amine concentration of D-2000. The

bulletin in exhibit A. In addition to this, Applicants see no suggestion from Locke et al. of an amine component having a concentration of about 40% to about 80% secondary amine as recited in claims 1, 2 and 29 along with the other limitations of those claims.

Importance of Secondary Amine Level

As suggested, Applicants believe that the amine ranges recited for the claims of the present application have a high degree of importance particularly when considered in conjunction with all the language of the claims of the present application. First, the levels of amines recited in the claims can alleviate problems that are cause by undesirably high levels of primary amine. Second, the levels of amines recited in the claims assist in providing a coating having particularly desirable properties.

As recited in claims 1, 2 and 29, the primary amine is between about 10% to about 40% of the second component. This is in contrast to higher levels of primary amine in compositions like those of Locke et al. Generally, primary amines tend to be highly reactive and, as a consequence, undesirably high amounts of such amines can cause difficulty when used to coat a surface, particularly when used in the processes recited in claims of the present application. For example, the undesirably high levels of primary amine can cause non-leveling (e.g., clumping) if such levels of primary amines are used in coating. Moreover, such undesirably high levels of primary amines can cause gelation in spray nozzles, which can effect output consistency and output levels for such nozzles. Additionally, such undesirably high levels of primary amines can cause lack of cohesiveness and/or strength when a coating is applied as a multi-pass spray (i.e., sprayed onto a substrate in multiple passes). As can be imagined, the second two disadvantages would be particularly detrimental to processes such as those in claims 2 and 3, which recite robotic spraying of the composition, and particularly spraying onto bedliners.

Also, as recited in claims, 1, 2 and 29, the secondary amine is between about 40% and about 80% of the second component. This, again, is in contrast to compositions like those of Locke et al. Advantageously, this level of secondary amine can impart multiple desirable effects for the processes of the claims of the

present applications. This level of secondary amine can slow down the reaction time of the coating. In turn, the level of second amine can assist in allowing the coating to level itself to a greater degree once applied to a surface. Additionally, the slower reaction time can assist in allowing for better molecule orientation (e.g., greater cross-linking) and greater whetting of a surface to which the coating is applied. As such, the coating can exhibit improved properties such as improved toughness, improved adhesion or the like. These advantages are particularly pertinent to processes that robotically spray such as the processes of claims 2 and 3 and particularly pertinent to processes that spray bedliners such as the processes of claims 2 and 3 and, also, particularly pertinent to process that have properties such as the properties recited in the processes of claims 1 and 3.

Applicants believe that the remarks above illustrate the distinctions between the references of record and the claims of the present application. Applicants respectfully request that the claims of the present application be allowed.

CONCLUSIONS

In view of Applicants' amendments and remarks, the Examiner's rejections are believed to be rendered moot. Accordingly, Applicants submit that the present application is in condition for allowance and requests that the Examiner pass the case to issue at the earliest convenience. Should the Examiner have any question or wish to further discuss this application, Applicant requests that the Examiner contact the undersigned at (248) 292-2920.

If for some reason Applicant has not requested a sufficient extension and/or have not paid a sufficient fee for this response and/or for the extension necessary to prevent the abandonment of this application, please consider this as a request for an extension for the required time period and/or authorization to charge our Deposit Account No. 50-1097 for any fee which may be due.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 1 August, 2005

Scott Chapple
Registration No. 46,287
DOBRUSIN & THENNISCH PC
29 W. Lawrence Street
Suite 210
Pontiac, MI 48342
(248) 292-2920

Customer No. 25215